REMARKS

In view of the following comments, and pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Office Action.

Summary of the Amendment

The Office Action provided grounds for the rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 7-10, 12-19 and 21-24. Claims 2, 3, 6, 11, and 20 were previously canceled. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 12, 15, and 18 were amended. Support for the amendments can be found at least in the originally filed claims and ¶ 0051, 0053, 0055, and 0056. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1, 4, 5, 7-10, 12-19 and 21-24, and allowance of the present application in view of the following remarks.

Detailed Remarks

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action, at page 3, asserts rejections of claims 1, 4-5, 7-10, 12, 14-19, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,525) ("Johnson '525") in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0006126 A1) ("Johnson '126") and further in view of Malec (U.S. Patent No. 4,973,952). The Office Action, at page 14, asserts rejections of claims 13 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson '525 in view of Johnson '126 and further in view of Malec and further in view of Examiner's Official Notice. The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "automatically estimating, using the detected context-identifying keywords, a first geographic location of the sales agent and the customer on a retail sales floor to identify a first geographic context of the interaction between the sales agent and the customer." Claim 1 further recites "when one of the detected context-identifying keywords is relevant to the first product and a second product, wherein the first and the second products relate to different geographical locations, automatically correlating the detected context-identifying keywords with the

first geographic context to identify additional information about the first product common to the second product." The Application, at ¶ 0055, discloses the system correlates a detected keyword with geographic information to identify a first product with features of a second product, where the first and second products are located in different departments of a store. The Office Action, at pages 3-6, asserts that Johnson '525, in combination with Johnson '126 and Malec, teaches or suggests estimating a geographic location of a sales agent and a customer.

However, Johnson '525, alone or in combination with Johnson '126 and Malec, does not teach, suggest or disclose automatically estimating, using detected context-identifying keywords, a first geographic location of a sales agent and the customer on a retail sales floor, let alone automatically correlating the detected context-identifying keywords with a first geographic context to identify additional information about a first product common to a second product, as claimed. Instead, Johnson '525 is directed to a sales force automation system. The Office Action, at page 6, concedes that Johnson '525 fails to "disclose determining the customer/agent location."

Johnson '126 fails to fill the gap left by Johnson '525. Johnson '126 is directed to a system that provides a user access to information from an information source using voice inputs or commands. Johnson '126, at ¶ 0037, discloses that in response to audio inputs from a user, a communication node retrieves information from information sources. Nowhere does Johnson '126 express the notion of automatically estimating, using detected context-identifying keywords, a first geographic location of a sales agent and the customer on a retail sales floor, let alone automatically correlating the detected context-identifying keywords with a first geographic context to identify additional information about a first product common to a second product, as claimed. The Office Action, at page 6, concedes that Johnson '525 fails to "disclose determining the customer/agent location."

Malec fails to fill the gap left by Johnson '525 and Johnson '126. Instead, Malec is directed to a Shopping Cart Display (SCD) that can deliver messages to a shopping cart based on the location of the SCD in a store. Malec, at col. 1, ll. 55-57, discloses an electronic display device mounted on the cart can deliver unique messages depending

on the location of the cart in the store. Malec, at col. 2, II. 20-28, discloses that transmitters located throughout a store act as signposts to inform a device of the device's location. Malec uses transmitters to signal information to the SCD. Malec in no way teaches, suggests or discloses automatically estimating, using detected context-identifying keywords, a first geographic location of a sales agent and a customer on a retail sales floor to identify a first geographic context of an interaction between the sales agent and the customer. Moreover, nowhere does Malec express even the slightest notion of automatically correlating detected context-identifying keywords with a first geographic context to identify additional information about a first product common to a second product. Thus, Johnson '525, even in combination with Johnson '126 and Malec, cannot be read to teach, suggest or disclose all the features of claim1. Therefore, claim 1 and claims 4-5, 22 and 23, which depend from claim 1, are patentable over the references taken alone or in combination.

Claim 1 further recites "based on the one or more contexts, ignoring a sub-set of spoken words among the spoken words, wherein the set of spoken words are relevant to a second geographic context different from the first geographic context." The Application, at ¶ 0051, discloses the system reduces the processing of speech data by focusing on identifying keywords related to one context, and avoiding keywords related to another context. Nowhere does Johnson '525, alone or in combination with Johnson '126 and Malec, teach, suggest or disclose based on the one or more contexts, ignoring a sub-set of spoken words among the spoken words, as claimed. Thus, claim 1 and claims 4-5, 22 and 23, which depend from claim 1, are patentable over the references taken alone or in combination.

Claim 1 also recites "providing the retrieved information in an electronically presentable format to the sales agent to be shared with the customer including analyzing the retrieved information to determine an amount of the retrieved information to display; identifying a suitably equipped display device which is in data communication with the processor and which is appropriate for displaying the amount of retrieved information; and routing the retrieved information to the suitably equipped display device." The Application, at ¶ 0056, discloses that when the amount of content to be

displayed readably requires a large display, the system provides a list of available nearby large-screen displays, and routes the content to a large display in order to provide a better view of additional information for the customer. The Application, at ¶ 0082, discloses the system routes the content to a suitably equipped display device such as a nearby large plasma display. Nowhere does Johnson '525, alone or in combination with Johnson '126 and Malec, teach, suggest or disclose analyzing retrieved information, identifying a suitably equipped display device and routing the retrieved information to the suitably equipped display device, as claimed. Thus, claim 1 and claims 4-5, 22 and 23, which depend from claim 1, are patentable over the references taken alone or in combination.

Independent claim 7, as amended, recites "based on the retrieved first and second information, and an amount of the retrieved first and second information to be displayed, identifying a suitably equipped display device appropriate for displaying the amount of retrieved information, and routing the retrieved information to the suitably equipped display device." As noted above in conjunction with claim 1, the cited references fail to show, describe or suggest this feature.

Independent claim 12, as amended, recites "automatically analyze the retrieved information to determine an amount of the retrieved information to be displayed, identify a suitably equipped display device appropriate for displaying the amount of retrieved information, and route the retrieved information to the suitably equipped display device." Claim 12 further recites programming code operational with the data processing system to: "produce an updated audio or video presentation of the retrieved information which is relevant to the updated context or the updated geographic context of the conversation; and display the updated audio or video presentation on the suitably equipped display device." As noted above in conjunction with claim 1, the cited references fail to show, describe or suggest these features.

Independent claims 15, as amended, recites "a location determining device configured to ... automatically analyze the current information to determine an amount of the current information to be displayed, identify a suitably equipped display device from a plurality of display devices including the input/output device, in the current

geographical location appropriate for displaying the amount of the current information, and route the current information to the suitably equipped display device." As noted above, the cited references fail to show, describe or suggest this feature.

Independent claim 18, as amended, recites "(f) automatically analyzing the identified information to determine an amount of the identified information to be displayed, identifying a suitably equipped display device appropriate for displaying the amount of retrieved information, and routing the retrieved information to the suitably equipped display device; and displaying the identified information on the suitably equipped display associated with the computing device for use by the sales agent in identifying purchase requirements of the customer." As noted above, the cited references fail to show, describe or suggest this feature.

For at least the same reasons as explained above regarding independent claim 1 and the references, independent claims 7, 12, 15 and 18, and the claims that depend from claims 7, 12, 15 and 18, are patentable over the references, taken alone or in combination.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks and amendments, the Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested. If for any reason the Application is not allowable, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/John G. Rauch/
John G. Rauch
Registration No. 37,218
Attorney for Applicant

November 19, 2009
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
CUSTOMER NO. 28164
Telephone: (312) 321-4200
Facsimile: (312) 321-4299